IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SUSAN SHOEMAKER,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 08 cv 14 SLR
CHELCIE McCONNELL and STACEY McCONNELL,)	Jury Trial Demanded
Defendants.)	

DEFENDANTS CHELCIE McCONNELL AND STACEY McCONNELL'S MOTION TO DISMISS

STEPHEN P. CASARINO, ESQ. Delaware Bar I.D. No. 174
Scasarino@casarino.com
SARAH C. BRANNAN, ESQ. Delaware Bar I.D. No. 4685
Sbrannan@casarino.com
800 N. King Street, Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19899-1276
(302) 594-4500
Attorneys for the Defendants

Attorneys for Plaintiff: Vincent J. X. Hedrick, II, Esq. Beverly L. Bove, Esq.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SUSAN SHOEMAKER,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.) No.: 08 cv 14 SI	LR
CHELCIE McCONNELL and) Jury Trial Deman	ded
STACEY McCONNELL,)	
Defendants.)	

MOTION TO DISMISS

Defendants Chelcie McConnell and Stacey McConnell move, pursuant to Rule 12(b)(2), to dismiss the above captioned action against them for lack of personal jurisdiction. In support of their motion, the defendants state as follows:

- 1. The plaintiff, Susan Shoemaker, has filed this action in the U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware. A copy of the complaint is attached as "Exhibit A".
- 2. Although the complaint does not state where the accident occurred, the defendants represent that the accident occurred in the State of Ohio. In addition, at all relevant times, defendants resided in the State of Ohio.
- 3. In order for the district court to properly exercise personal jurisdiction over the defendants, the defendants must have minimal contacts with the forum state with regard to the cause of action. *International Shoe v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 319 (1945) (cause of action must "arise out of" or "relate to" the defendant's contacts with the forum); *Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz*, 471 U.S. 462, 472 (1985); *Grimes v. Vitalink Communications Corp.*, 17 F.3d 1553

(3d Cir. 1994), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 986 (1994). This contact may be specific or general in nature. Grimes, 17 F.3d at 1559 (discussing requisites for court's exercise of personal iurisdiction.)

- Defendants have had no contacts with Delaware as a general matter or as 4. specifically related to the accident.
- Plaintiff has not presented any evidence establishing personal jurisdiction of the 5. U.S. District Court for the State of Delaware over the defendants. Hansen v. Neumueller GmbH, 163 F.R.D. 471, 474-75 (D. Del. 1995).
- Because the defendants lack the minimal contacts required for assertion of 6. personal jurisdiction over them by this Court, this Court lacks personal jurisdiction to hear the matter.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons discussed above, defendants Chelcie McConnell and Stacey McConnell respectfully request that the instant motion to dismiss be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Sarah C. Brannan STEPHEN P. CASARINO, ESQ. Delaware Bar I.D. No. 174 Scasarino@casarino.com SARAH C. BRANNAN, ESQ. Delaware Bar I.D. No. 4685 Sbrannan@casarino.com 800 N. King Street, Suite 200 Wilmington, DE 19899-1276 (302) 594-4500 Attorneys for the Defendants

March 18, 2008

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SUSAN SHOEMAKER,	
Plaintiff,))
v.) No.: 08 cv 14 SLR
CHELCIE McCONNELL and STACEY McCONNELL, Defendants.) Jury Trial Demanded)))
	<u>ORDER</u>
AND NOW, this day	y of, 2008, the Court having heard
and considered Defendants Motion, IT l	S HEREBY ORDERED that the above captioned case is
DISMISSED with prejudice.	
Ju	dge